

ON THE UNIQUENESS OF SIGN CHANGING BOUND STATE SOLUTIONS OF A SEMILINEAR EQUATION

CARMEN CORTÁZAR, MARTA GARCÍA-HUIDOBRO, AND CECILIA S. YARUR

ABSTRACT. We establish the uniqueness of the higher radial bound state solutions of

$$(P) \quad \Delta u + f(u) = 0, \quad x \in \mathbb{R}^n.$$

We assume that the nonlinearity $f \in C(-\infty, \infty)$ is an odd function satisfying some convexity and growth conditions, and either has one zero at $b > 0$, is non positive and not identically 0 in $(0, b)$, and is differentiable and positive $[b, \infty)$, or is positive and differentiable in $[0, \infty)$.

January 26, 2010

1. INTRODUCTION AND MAIN RESULTS

In this paper we establish the uniqueness of higher bound state solutions to

$$(P) \quad \Delta u + f(u) = 0, \quad x \in \mathbb{R}^n,$$

in the radial situation. That is, we give conditions on f under which

$$\begin{aligned} u''(r) + \frac{n-1}{r}u'(r) + f(u) &= 0, \quad r > 0, \quad n \geq 2, \\ u'(0) &= 0, \quad \lim_{r \rightarrow \infty} u(r) = 0, \end{aligned} \tag{1}$$

has exactly two solutions, one with $u(0) > 0$ and one with $u(0) < 0$, having a prescribed number of zeros.

Any nonconstant solution to (1) is called a bound state solution. Bound state solutions such that $u(r) > 0$ for all $r > 0$, are referred to as a first bound state solution, or a ground state solution. The uniqueness of the first bound state solution of (1) or for the quasilinear situation involving the m -Laplacian operator $\nabla \cdot (|\nabla u|^{m-2} \nabla u)$, $m > 1$, has been exhaustively studied during the last thirty years, see for example the works [Ch-L], [C1], [CEF1], [CEF2], [FLS], [K], [McL], [McLS], [PeS1], [PeS2], [PuS], [ST].

We will assume that the function $f : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is continuous, and that f satisfies (f_1) -(f_2), where

(f_1) f is odd, $f(0) = 0$, and there exist $\beta > b > 0$ such that $f(s) > 0$ for $s > b$, $f(s) \leq 0$, $f(s) \not\equiv 0$ for $s \in [0, b]$,¹ $F(\beta) = 0$, where $F(s) := \int_0^s f(t)dt$.

(f_2) f is continuous in $[0, \infty)$, continuously differentiable in $(0, \infty)$ and $f' \in L^1(0, 1)$.

Our first result deals with the uniqueness of the k -th bound state in space dimension $1 < n \leq 4$:

This research was supported by FONDECYT-1070944 for the first author, and FONDECYT-1070951 and FONDECYT-1070125 for the second and third author.

¹The oddness of f is not essential, this assumption can be relaxed to a sign condition: $f(0) = 0$, and there exist $b^+ > 0 > b^-$ such that $f(u) > 0$ for $u > b^+$, $f(u) < 0$ for $u < b^-$, and $f(u) \leq 0$, $f(u) \not\equiv 0$, for $u \in (0, b^+)$ and $f(u) \geq 0$, $f(u) \not\equiv 0$, for $u \in (b^-, 0)$

Theorem 1.1. *Let $1 < n \leq 4$, $k \in \mathbb{N}$, and assume that f satisfies (f_1) -(f_2). If in addition f satisfies*

$$(f_4) \quad \left(\frac{F}{f}\right)'(s) \geq \frac{n-2}{2} \text{ for all } s > \beta,$$

then problem (1) has at most one solution satisfying $u(0) > 0$ which has exactly $k-1$ sign changes in $(0, \infty)$.

Our second result is a strong improvement of the one in [CGHY]:

Theorem 1.2. *Assume that f satisfies (f_1) -(f_2). If f satisfies*

$$(f_3) \quad f(s) \geq f'(s)(s - \beta), \text{ for all } s \geq \beta, \text{ and}$$

$$(f_4) \quad \left(\frac{F}{f}\right)'(s) \geq \frac{n-2}{2n} \text{ for all } s > \beta,$$

then problem (1) has at most one solution satisfying $u(0) > 0$ which has exactly one sign change in $(0, \infty)$. The same conclusion holds if instead of (f_3) -(f_4), f satisfies

$$(f_5) \quad \frac{sf'(s)}{f(s)} \text{ decreases for all } s \geq \beta, \text{ and}$$

$$(f_6) \quad \frac{\beta f'(\beta)}{f(\beta)} \leq \frac{n}{n-2}, \text{ with } n > 2.$$

This work can be seen as a natural continuation of [CGHY], where we established uniqueness of the second bound state solution in the superlinear case.

To the best of our knowledge, there is only one work (besides [CGHY]) concerning the uniqueness of higher bound states: Troy, see [T, Theorems 1.1, Theorem 1.3] studied the existence and uniqueness of the solution to (1) having exactly one sign change in dimension $n = 3$ for

$$f(s) = \begin{cases} s+1, & s \leq -1/2, \\ -s, & s \in (-1/2, 1/2), \\ s-1, & s \geq 1/2. \end{cases}$$

Note that in this case $b = 1$, $\beta = 1 + \sqrt{2}/2$, and for $s > \beta$,

$$(s - \beta)f'(s) = s - 1 - \frac{\sqrt{2}}{2} < s - 1.$$

Hence all assumptions (f_1) -(f_3) are satisfied. Moreover, also (f_4') is satisfied, since for $s \geq \beta$,

$$\left(\frac{F}{f}\right)'(s) = \frac{1}{2} + \frac{1}{4(s-1)^2} \geq \frac{1}{2} = \frac{n-2}{2} \Big|_{n=3} \quad \text{for all } s \geq \beta.$$

Hence, according to our Theorem 1.1, in this case problem (1) has at most one solution with exactly k zeros in $(0, \infty)$ for any $k \in \mathbb{N}$. Other typical example of a function f satisfying the assumptions of Theorem 1.1 is

$$f(s) = s^p - s^q, \quad p > q > 0,$$

with no other restriction if $n = 2$, and $p^2 + q^2 \leq 1$ when $n = 3$.

We also deal with the Dirichlet problem in a given ball. In this case we establish non uniqueness of solutions for some f satisfying (f_1) -(f_3) (see section 5) and we are led to study the situation in the case that $b = 0$, that is, f is positive in $(0, \infty)$. More precisely, we assume

$$(f_1') \quad f(0) = 0, \text{ and } sf(s) > 0 \text{ for } s > 0,$$

- (f'_2) f is continuous in $[0, \infty)$, continuously differentiable in $(0, \infty)$ and $f' \in L^1(0, 1)$,
 (f'_3) $f(s) \geq sf'(s)$, for all $s > 0$, and for any $\varepsilon > 0$ there exists $s \in (0, \varepsilon)$ such that $f(s) > sf'(s)$.

We have imposed the second part in (f'_3) to avoid f linear, for in this case we obviously do not have uniqueness.

On the other hand, it can be shown, see section 5, that under these assumptions there do not exist nontrivial bound states, hence for a given $\rho > 0$, we study the Dirichlet problem

$$\begin{aligned} u''(r) + \frac{n-1}{r}u'(r) + f(u) &= 0, \quad r \in (0, \rho), \quad n \geq 2, \\ u'(0) &= 0, \quad u(\rho) = 0, \end{aligned} \quad (2)$$

and prove the following result:

Theorem 1.3. *Assume that f satisfies (f'_1)-(f'_3), and let $k \in \mathbb{N}$. Then problem (2) has at most one solution satisfying $u(0) > 0$ which has exactly k zeros in $(0, \rho)$.*

The existence of sign changing bound state solutions of (1) has been established by Coffman in [C2] and McLeod, Troy and Weissler in [McLTW], where $f : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is locally Lipschitz continuous and satisfies appropriate sign conditions and is of subcritical growth. Their proof uses shooting techniques and a scaling argument. Here we also establish existence by adapting some results in [FLS]. In [McLTW] the function f is assumed to satisfy (besides (f_1) and (f_2))

$$f(u) = C|u|^{p-1}u + g(u), \quad u > 0,$$

where C is a positive constant, $g(u) = o(u^p)$ as $u \rightarrow \infty$, and $1 < p < \frac{n+2}{n-2}$, i.e., it is superlinear and subcritical. They also establish existence for the Dirichlet problem in a ball.

Finally we describe our approach. In order to prove our results, and due to the oddness of f , we will study the behavior of the solutions to the initial value problem

$$\begin{aligned} u''(r) + \frac{n-1}{r}u'(r) + f(u) &= 0 \quad r > 0, \quad n \geq 2, \\ u(0) &= \alpha \quad u'(0) = 0 \end{aligned} \quad (3)$$

for $\alpha \in (0, \infty)$. As usual, we will denote by $u(r, \alpha)$ a C^2 solution of (3).

Our theorems will follow after a series of comparison results between two solutions to (3) with initial value in some small neighborhood of α^* , where $u(\cdot, \alpha^*)$ is a k -th bound state, that is, $u(r, \alpha^*)$ is a solution to (3) which has exactly $k-1$ sign changes in $(0, \infty)$ and $\lim_{r \rightarrow \infty} u(r, \alpha^*) = 0$. We will show, (see Proposition 2.2 and Lemma 4.1), that there exists a neighborhood V of α^* such that any solution to (3) with $\alpha \in V$ has k extremal points in some closed interval $[0, A]$, $A > 0$, having extremal values $|E| > \beta$. In Section 3 we follow the ideas of Coffman, see [C1], and use the function $\varphi(r, \alpha) = \frac{\partial}{\partial \alpha} u(r, \alpha)$ to study the behavior of the solutions between two consecutive extremal points. In Section 4 we prove Theorem 1.1 through a careful analysis of the behavior of two solutions $u_1(r) = u(r, \alpha_1)$, $u_2(r) = u(r, \alpha_2)$ for α_1, α_2 in a small neighborhood of α^* . The main tool we use is the functional

$$Q(s, \alpha) = -4 \frac{F}{f}(s) \frac{r(s, \alpha)}{r'(s, \alpha)} - \frac{r^2(s, \alpha)}{(r'(s, \alpha))^2} - 2r^2(s, \alpha)F(s) + H(s), \quad s \neq b,$$

where $H(s)$ is chosen appropriately so that

$$Q'(s, \alpha) = \frac{\partial Q}{\partial s}(s, \alpha) = \left(2(n-2) - 4\left(\frac{F}{f}\right)'(s)\right) \frac{r(s, \alpha)}{r'(s, \alpha)},$$

and the functional W defined by

$$W(s, \alpha) = r(s, \alpha) \sqrt{(u'(r(s, \alpha), \alpha))^2 + 2F(s)}, \quad s \in [U_m(\alpha), \alpha],$$

introduced in [FLS]. Here $r(s, \alpha)$ denotes the inverse of u between two consecutive extremal points. In view of hypothesis (f'_4) , the functional Q allows us to prove some key comparison results concerning the solutions u_1 and u_2 between their $i-1$ -th and i -th extremal points, for any $i = 1, \dots, k-1$.

Section 4.2 is devoted to the proof of Theorem 1.2, where we use ideas of Pucci, Serrin and Tang in [PuS, ST] to study the behavior of the solutions in the interval $[\bar{U}_1, -\beta]$ before the minimum. We do so by considering the celebrated functional introduced first by Erbe and Tang in [ET]:

$$P(s, \alpha) = -2n \frac{F}{f}(s) \frac{r^{n-1}(s, \alpha)}{r'(s, \alpha)} - \frac{r^n(s, \alpha)}{(r'(s, \alpha))^2} - 2r^n(s, \alpha)F(s), \quad s \neq b,$$

and the modified functional $\tilde{W}$ defined by

$$\tilde{W}(s, \alpha) = r^{n-1}(s, \alpha) \sqrt{(u'(r(s, \alpha), \alpha))^2 + 2F(s)}, \quad s \in [\bar{U}(\alpha), \alpha]$$

where $r(s, \alpha)$ denotes the inverse of u before the first minimum point.

Finally in section 5 we treat the Dirichlet problem and sketch the proof of Theorem 1.3.

2. PRELIMINARIES

The aim of this section is to establish several properties of the solutions to the initial value problem (3).

The functional

$$I(r, \alpha) = (u'(r, \alpha))^2 + 2F(u(r, \alpha)) \tag{4}$$

will play a fundamental role. A simple calculation yields

$$I'(r, \alpha) = -\frac{2(n-1)}{r}(u'(r))^2, \tag{5}$$

and therefore, as $n \geq 2$, we have that I is decreasing in r . It can be seen that for $\alpha \in (b, \infty)$, one has $u(r, \alpha) > 0$ and $u'(r, \alpha) < 0$ for r small enough, and thus we can define the extended real number

$$Z_1(\alpha) := \sup\{r > 0 \mid u(s, \alpha) > 0 \text{ and } u'(s, \alpha) < 0 \text{ for all } s \in (0, r)\}.$$

Following [PeS1], [PeS2] we set

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{N}_1 &= \{\alpha > 0 : u(Z_1(\alpha), \alpha) = 0 \text{ and } u'(Z_1(\alpha), \alpha) < 0\} \\ \mathcal{G}_1 &= \{\alpha > 0 : u(Z_1(\alpha), \alpha) = 0 \text{ and } u'(Z_1(\alpha), \alpha) = 0\} \\ \mathcal{P}_1 &= \{\alpha > 0 : u(Z_1(\alpha), \alpha) > 0\}. \end{aligned}$$

As in [CEF1], the sets $\mathcal{N}_1$ and $\mathcal{P}_1$ are open intervals, and moreover, if $\mathcal{N}_1 \neq \emptyset$, then $\mathcal{N}_1 = (a, \infty)$ for some $a > 0$. If our problems have a solution, then $\mathcal{N}_1 \neq \emptyset$. Let

$$\tilde{\mathcal{F}}_2 = \{\alpha \in \mathcal{N}_1 : u'(r, \alpha) < 0 \text{ for all } r > Z_1(\alpha)\}.$$

For $\alpha \notin \tilde{\mathcal{F}}_2$ we define

$$T_1(\alpha) := \inf\{r > Z_1(\alpha) : u'(r, \alpha) = 0\}, \quad \overline{U}_1(\alpha) = u(T_1(\alpha), \alpha),$$

and if $\alpha \in \tilde{\mathcal{F}}_2$, we set $T_1(\alpha) = \infty$. Also, for $\alpha \in \mathcal{N}_1 \setminus \tilde{\mathcal{F}}_2$ we can define the extended real number

$$Z_2(\alpha) := \sup\{r > T_1(\alpha) \mid u(s, \alpha) < 0 \text{ and } u'(s, \alpha) > 0 \text{ for all } s \in (T_1(\alpha), r)\},$$

and set $U_2(\alpha) := u(Z_2(\alpha), \alpha) = \lim_{r \uparrow Z_2(\alpha)} u(r, \alpha)$.

Let now

$$\mathcal{F}_2 = \{\alpha \in \mathcal{N}_1 \setminus \tilde{\mathcal{F}}_2 : u(Z_2(\alpha), \alpha) < 0\},$$

$$\mathcal{N}_2 = \{\alpha \in \mathcal{N}_1 \setminus \tilde{\mathcal{F}}_2 : u(Z_2(\alpha), \alpha) = 0 \text{ and } u'(Z_2(\alpha), \alpha) > 0\},$$

$$\mathcal{G}_2 = \{\alpha \in \mathcal{N}_1 \setminus \tilde{\mathcal{F}}_2 : u(Z_2(\alpha), \alpha) = 0 \text{ and } u'(Z_2(\alpha), \alpha) = 0\},$$

$$\mathcal{P}_2 = \tilde{\mathcal{F}}_2 \cup \mathcal{F}_2.$$

For $k \geq 3$, and if $\mathcal{N}_{k-1} \neq \emptyset$, we set

$$\tilde{\mathcal{F}}_k = \{\alpha \in \mathcal{N}_{k-1} : (-1)^k u'(r, \alpha) < 0 \text{ for all } r > Z_{k-1}(\alpha)\}.$$

For $\alpha \notin \tilde{\mathcal{F}}_k$, we set

$$T_{k-1}(\alpha) := \inf\{r > Z_{k-1}(\alpha) : u'(r, \alpha) = 0\}, \quad \overline{U}_{k-1}(\alpha) = u(T_{k-1}(\alpha), \alpha),$$

and if $\alpha \in \tilde{\mathcal{F}}_k$, we set $T_{k-1}(\alpha) = \infty$. Next, for $\alpha \in \mathcal{N}_{k-1} \setminus \tilde{\mathcal{F}}_k$, we define the extended real number

$$Z_k(\alpha) := \sup\{r > T_{k-1}(\alpha) \mid (-1)^k u(s, \alpha) < 0 \text{ and } (-1)^k u'(s, \alpha) > 0 \text{ for all } s \in (T_{k-1}(\alpha), r)\},$$

we set $U_k(\alpha) := u(Z_k(\alpha), \alpha) = \lim_{r \uparrow Z_k(\alpha)} u(r, \alpha)$. Finally we set

$$\mathcal{F}_k = \{\alpha \in \mathcal{N}_{k-1} \setminus \tilde{\mathcal{F}}_k : (-1)^k u(Z_k(\alpha), \alpha) < 0\},$$

$$\mathcal{N}_k = \{\alpha \in \mathcal{N}_{k-1} \setminus \tilde{\mathcal{F}}_k : u(Z_k(\alpha), \alpha) = 0 \text{ and } (-1)^k u'(Z_k(\alpha), \alpha) > 0\},$$

$$\mathcal{G}_k = \{\alpha \in \mathcal{N}_{k-1} \setminus \tilde{\mathcal{F}}_k : u(Z_k(\alpha), \alpha) = 0 \text{ and } u'(Z_k(\alpha), \alpha) = 0\},$$

$$\mathcal{P}_k = \tilde{\mathcal{F}}_k \cup \mathcal{F}_k.$$

Concerning the sets $\mathcal{N}_k$ and $\mathcal{P}_k$ we have:

Proposition 2.1. *The sets $\mathcal{N}_k$ and $\mathcal{P}_k$ are open.*

Proof. The proof that $\mathcal{N}_k$ is open is by continuity and follows as in [CEF2] with obvious modifications, so we omit it.

The proof that $\mathcal{P}_k$ is open is based in the fact that the functional I defined in (4) is decreasing in r , and $\alpha \in \mathcal{P}_k$ if and only if $\alpha \in \mathcal{N}_{k-1}$ and $I(r_1, \alpha) < 0$ for some $r_1 \in (0, T_{k-1}(\alpha))$.

Let $\alpha \in \mathcal{P}_k$ and assume first that $Z_k(\alpha) = \infty$. We claim that

$$\lim_{r \rightarrow \infty} u(r, \alpha) = -b, \quad \lim_{r \rightarrow \infty} u'(r, \alpha) = 0.$$

Since $u(\cdot, \alpha)$ is monotone (for all $r > Z_{k-1}$ if $\alpha \in \tilde{\mathcal{F}}_k$ or in $(T_{k-1}(\alpha), \infty)$ if $\alpha \in \mathcal{F}_k$), there exists L such that $\lim_{r \rightarrow \infty} u(r, \alpha) = L$. Furthermore, since $I(\cdot, \alpha)$ is decreasing and bounded

and $F(s) \rightarrow \infty$ as $s \rightarrow \pm\infty$, we have that L is finite and $\lim_{r \rightarrow \infty} u'(r, \alpha) = 0$. Moreover, from the equation and applying L'Hôpital's rule twice, we conclude that

$$0 = \lim_{r \rightarrow \infty} \frac{u(r, \alpha) - L}{r^2} = \lim_{r \rightarrow \infty} \frac{r^{n-1} u'(r, \alpha)}{2r^n} = -\frac{f(L)}{2n},$$

Thus, $L = -b$ as we claimed, implying that

$$\lim_{r \rightarrow T_{k-1}(\alpha)} I(r, \alpha) = 2F(-b) < 0.$$

Assume next $Z_k(\alpha) < \infty$ and hence $\alpha \in \mathcal{F}_k$. Then $T_{k-1}(\alpha)$ is either a maximum point or a minimum point of $u(\cdot, \alpha)$ implying that either

$$0 \leq -u''(T_{k-1}(\alpha), \alpha) = f(u(T_{k-1}(\alpha), \alpha))$$

and thus $-b < u(T_{k-1}(\alpha), \alpha) < 0$ or

$$0 \geq -u''(T_{k-1}(\alpha), \alpha) = f(u(T_{k-1}(\alpha), \alpha))$$

and thus $0 < u(T_{k-1}(\alpha), \alpha) < b$, ($u(T_{k-1}(\alpha), \alpha) \neq \pm b$ from the uniqueness of the solutions and since $u(0, \alpha) = \alpha$). Hence

$$I(T_{k-1}(\alpha), \alpha) = 2F(u(T_{k-1}(\alpha), \alpha)) < 0.$$

Conversely, if $\alpha \notin \mathcal{P}_k$ and $\alpha \in \mathcal{N}_{k-1}$, then $\alpha \in \mathcal{G}_k \cup \mathcal{N}_k$, and thus the claim follows from the fact that $I(r, \alpha) \geq I(Z_k(\alpha), \alpha) \geq 0$ for all $r \in (0, Z_k(\alpha))$. Hence the openness of $\mathcal{P}_k$ follows from the continuous dependence of solutions to (3) in the initial value α and from the openness of $\mathcal{N}_{k-1}$. $\square$

Finally in this section we establish the existence of a neighborhood of α^* so that solutions with initial value in this interval cannot be decreasing for all $r > 0$.

Proposition 2.2. *Let $\alpha^* \in \mathcal{G}_k$, $k \geq 2$. Then there exists $\delta_0 > 0$ such that $(\alpha^* - \delta_0, \alpha^* + \delta_0) \subseteq \mathcal{N}_{k-1} \setminus \tilde{\mathcal{F}}_k$.*

Proof. Since $\alpha^* \in \mathcal{G}_k$, there exists $\tau > T_{k-1}(\alpha^*)$ such that $(-1)^k u'(\tau, \alpha^*) > 0$. By continuity, there exists $\delta_0 > 0$ such that

$$(-1)^k u'(\tau, \alpha) > 0 \quad \text{for all } \alpha \in (\alpha^* - \delta_0, \alpha^* + \delta_0),$$

implying that

$$T_{k-1}(\alpha) < \tau \quad \text{for all } \alpha \in (\alpha^* - \delta_0, \alpha^* + \delta_0),$$

and thus

$$(\alpha^* - \delta_0, \alpha^* + \delta_0) \subset \mathcal{N}_{k-1} \setminus \tilde{\mathcal{F}}_k.$$

$\square$

3. BEHAVIOR OF THE FUNCTION $\varphi(r, \alpha) = \frac{\partial}{\partial \alpha} u(r, \alpha)$

We will study the behavior of the solutions to the initial value problem (3). To this end, $\alpha^* \in \mathcal{G}_k$ is fixed and $\alpha \in (\alpha^* - \delta_0, \alpha^* + \delta_0)$, where $\delta_0 > 0$ is given in Proposition 2.2.

Under assumptions (f_1) and (f_2) , the functions $u(r, \alpha)$ and $u'(r, \alpha) = \frac{\partial u}{\partial r}(r, \alpha)$ are of class C^1 in $(0, \infty) \times (b, \infty)$. We set

$$\varphi(r, \alpha) = \frac{\partial u}{\partial \alpha}(r, \alpha), \quad ' = \frac{\partial}{\partial r}.$$

Then, for any $r > 0$ such that $u(r) \neq 0$, φ satisfies the linear differential equation

$$\begin{aligned} \varphi''(r) + \frac{n-1}{r}\varphi'(r) + f'(u)\varphi &= 0, \quad n \geq 2, \\ \varphi(0, \alpha) &= 1 \quad \varphi'(0, \alpha) = 0. \end{aligned} \quad (6)$$

Set

$$u(r) = u(r, \alpha), \quad \varphi(r) = \varphi(r, \alpha).$$

Proposition 3.1. *Let f satisfy (f_1) – (f_2) . Then (i) between two consecutive zeros $r_1 < r_2$ of u' there is at least one zero $r^* \in (r_1, r_2)$ of φ . (ii) Furthermore, if $\alpha \in \mathcal{G}_k$, then φ has at least one zero in $(T_{k-1}(\alpha), Z_k(\alpha))$.*

Proof. Let $r_1 < r_2$ be two consecutive finite zeros of u' (hence u has at most one zero in (r_1, r_2)) and assume by contradiction that $\varphi(r)$ does not change sign in (r_1, r_2) . Since $u \in C^2(0, \infty)$ and $\varphi \in C^1(0, \infty)$, by differentiating the equation in (1) we obtain that $v = u'$ and φ satisfy

$$v'' + \frac{n-1}{r}v' + \left(f'(u) - \frac{n-1}{r^2}\right)v = 0, \quad (7)$$

and

$$\varphi'' + \frac{n-1}{r}\varphi' + f'(u)\varphi = 0, \quad (8)$$

for all r such that $u(r) \neq 0$. Hence multiplying (7) by $r^{n-1}\varphi$ and (8) by $r^{n-1}v$ and subtracting, we obtain

$$(r^{n-1}(v'\varphi - v\varphi'))'(r) = (n-1)r^{n-3}v\varphi. \quad (9)$$

Assume first that $v, \varphi > 0$ in (r_1, r_2) . Integrating (9) over (r_1, r_2) we find that

$$r_2^{n-1}v'(r_2)\varphi(r_2) > r_1^{n-1}v'(r_1)\varphi(r_1),$$

a contradiction with the fact that from our choice of the sign for v , it must be that $v'(r_2) < 0$ and $v'(r_1) > 0$. (If $u(\bar{r}) = 0$ for some $\bar{r} \in (r_1, r_2)$, we integrate (9) over $(r_1, \bar{r} - \varepsilon)$ and over $(\bar{r} + \varepsilon, r_2)$, use the continuity of v, v', φ and φ' , and then let $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$ to obtain a contradiction). Hence φ must have a first zero in (r_1, r_2) . If either v or φ are negative in (r_1, r_2) the proof follows with obvious modifications.

Let now $\alpha \in \mathcal{G}_k$. If $Z_k(\alpha) < \infty$, the claim follows from (i). If $Z_k(\alpha) = \infty$, assume by contradiction that φ does not change sign in $(T_{k-1}(\alpha), \infty)$. We may assume without loss of generality that $u'(r) > 0$ and $\varphi(r) > 0$ for all $r \in (T_{k-1}(\alpha), \infty)$. From $u'(r) > 0$ for all $r \in (T_{k-1}(\alpha), \infty)$, and $u(r) \rightarrow 0$ as $r \rightarrow \infty$, we find that there exists $r_0 > T_{k-1}(\alpha)$ such that $-b < u(r) < 0$ for all $r \in (r_0, \infty)$ implying

$$(r^{n-1}u')' = -r^{n-1}f(u) \leq 0.$$

Thus $r^{n-1}u'$ decreases in (r_0, ∞) implying that

$$\lim_{r \rightarrow \infty} r^{n-1}u'(r) = L \in [0, \infty). \quad (10)$$

From the equation we find that

$$u''(r) = -\frac{n-1}{r}u'(r) - f(u(r)) < 0 \quad \text{for all } r \in (r_0, \infty),$$

and thus $v' = u'' < 0$ for all $r \in (r_0, \infty)$. On the other hand, integrating (9) over $(T_{k-1}(\alpha), r)$, for $r \in (r_0, \infty)$, we find that

$$\begin{aligned} r^{n-1}(v'\varphi - v\varphi')(r) &= (T_{k-1}(\alpha))^{n-1}v'(T_{k-1}(\alpha))\varphi(T_{k-1}(\alpha)) \\ &\quad + (n-1) \int_{T_{k-1}(\alpha)}^r t^{n-3}v(t)\varphi(t)dt \\ &\geq (n-1) \int_{T_{k-1}(\alpha)}^{r_0} t^{n-3}v(t)\varphi(t)dt = c_0 > 0 \end{aligned}$$

for some positive constant c_0 . Hence,

$$0 > r^{n-1}v'(r)\varphi(r) > r^{n-1}v(r)\varphi'(r) + c_0,$$

which from (10) implies that $\varphi'(r) \leq -c_0/(r^{n-1}v) \leq -c$ for some positive constant c and therefore

$$\varphi(r) \leq \varphi(r_0) - c(r - r_0) \rightarrow -\infty \quad \text{as } r \rightarrow \infty,$$

a contradiction. $\square$

Proposition 3.2. *Let f satisfy (f_1) – (f_3) . Then φ is strictly positive in $(0, r(\beta, \alpha))$.*

Proof. Multiplying the equation in (6) by $r^{n-1}(u - \beta)$ and integrating by parts over $(0, r)$, $r \leq r(\beta, \alpha)$, we have that

$$- \int_0^r r^{n-1}u'(r)\varphi'(r)dr + \int_0^r f'(u(r))\varphi(r)(u(r) - \beta)r^{n-1}dr = 0,$$

and a second integration by parts yields

$$\int_0^r \left(f'(u(t))(u(t) - \beta) - f(u(t)) \right) \varphi(t)t^{n-1}dt = r^{n-1}(u'(r)\varphi(r) - \varphi'(r)(u(r) - \beta)). \quad (11)$$

Using now that from (f_3) , $f'(u(r))(u(r) - \beta) - f(u(r)) \leq 0$ for $r \in (0, r(\beta, \alpha))$, we have that if $\varphi(r) = 0$ for some $r \in (0, r(\beta, \alpha))$, then $-\varphi'(r)(u(r) - \beta) \leq 0$, which is a contradiction since $\varphi'(r) < 0$ at such point. $\square$

Our next result is an improvement of [CGHY, Lemma 3.1], where we proved it under an additional superlinear growth assumption on f .

Proposition 3.3. *Let f satisfy (f_1) – (f_2) and (f_4) – (f_5) . If the first zero $z > 0$ of φ occurs in $(0, r(\beta, \alpha)]$, then $\varphi(r) < 0$ for $r \in (z, r(b, \alpha))$ and $\varphi'(r(b, \alpha)) \leq 0$.*

Proof. The proof follows step by step the ideas in [CGHY]. Let the first zero $z > 0$ of φ occur in $(0, r(\beta, \alpha)]$, set $U_z := u(z)$ and assume $U_z \geq \beta$. We will show that

$$\frac{U_z f'(U_z)}{f(U_z)} > 1.$$

If not, then by (f_5) we have that

$$\frac{(s - U_z)f'(s)}{f(s)} < \frac{s f'(s)}{f(s)} \leq 1 \quad \text{for all } s \geq U_z,$$

and we can argue as in the proof of Proposition 3.2 (with β replaced by U_z) to obtain the contradiction

$$\int_0^z \left(f'(u(t))(u(t) - U_z) - f(u(t)) \right) \varphi(t)t^{n-1}dt = r^{n-1}(u'(r)\varphi(r) - \varphi'(r)(u(z) - U_z)) = 0.$$

We conclude that there exists $c > 0$ such that

$$\frac{U_z f'(U_z)}{f(U_z)} = 1 + \frac{2}{c}.$$

Moreover, from (f_5) – (f_6) , it must be that $c \geq n - 2$. Then, since by (f_5) , the function

$$r \rightarrow c \frac{u(r)f'(u(r))}{f(u(r))} - c - 2$$

is increasing in $(0, r(b, \alpha))$, we have that

$$\phi(r) := f(u(r)) \left(c \frac{u(r)f'(u(r))}{f(u(r))} - c - 2 \right)$$

is non positive in $(0, z)$ and nonnegative in $(z, r(b, \alpha))$.

Let us set $v(r) = ru'(r) + cu(r)$. Then v satisfies

$$v'' + \frac{n-1}{r}v' + f'(u(r))v = \phi(r),$$

and, as long as $\varphi(r)$ does not change sign in (z, r) , with $r \in (z, r(b, \alpha))$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} 0 &\geq \int_0^r t^{n-1} \varphi(t) \phi(t) dt = \int_0^r t^{n-1} (\varphi \Delta v - v \Delta \varphi) dt \\ &= r^{n-1} (\varphi(r) v'(r) - \varphi'(r) v(r)), \end{aligned} \quad (12)$$

and therefore

$$\varphi(r) v'(r) - \varphi'(r) v(r) \leq 0, \quad (13)$$

implying in particular that $v(z) \leq 0$. On the other hand, using that $c \geq n - 2$ we have that

$$v'(r) = ru''(r) + (c+1)u'(r) \leq ru''(r) + (n-1)u'(r) = -rf(u(r)) < 0$$

for all $r \in (0, r(b, \alpha))$. Now we can prove that z is the only zero of φ in $(0, r(b, \alpha))$. Indeed, if φ has a second zero at $z_1 \in r(b, \alpha)$, then from (13), it must be that $v(z_1) \geq 0$, contradicting $v'(r) < 0$ in $(0, r(b, \alpha))$. Hence φ has exactly one zero in $(0, r(b, \alpha)]$.

Finally, evaluating (13) at $r = r(b, \alpha)$, we find that

$$\varphi(r(b, \alpha)) v'(r(b, \alpha)) - \varphi'(r(b, \alpha)) v(r(b, \alpha)) \leq 0,$$

implying $\varphi'(r(b, \alpha)) \leq 0$. □

4. UNIQUENESS OF BOUND STATES

Assume that $\alpha^* \in \mathcal{G}_k$. The following result deals with the existence of a neighborhood V of α^* such that any solution to (3) with $\alpha \in V$ has its minimum values satisfying $U < -\beta$ and its maximum values satisfying $U > \beta$.

We observe that $u(\cdot, \alpha)$ is invertible in each interval $(T_{i-1}(\alpha), T_i(\alpha))$, $T_0(\alpha) = 0$, $i = 1, 2, \dots, k-1$, and we denote by $r(\cdot, \alpha)$ its inverse at the intervals where u decreases and by $\bar{r}(\cdot, \alpha)$ its inverse at intervals where u increases.

Lemma 4.1. *Let f satisfy (f_1) – (f_2) , and let $\alpha^* \in \mathcal{G}_k$. Then, there exist $a > 0$ and $\delta_1 > 0$, such that for any $\alpha \in (\alpha^* - \delta_1, \alpha^* + \delta_1)$, $u(\cdot, \alpha)$ has exactly k extremal points in $[0, T_{k-1}(\alpha^*) + a]$. The extremal values E of $u(\cdot, \alpha)$ satisfy $E < -\beta$ if E is a minimum value, while $E > \beta$ if E is a maximum value. Moreover, if $\alpha_1 < \alpha_2$ are two values in $(\alpha^* - \delta_1, \alpha^* + \delta_1)$, then*

- (i) *the corresponding solutions u_1 and u_2 intersect between any two of their consecutive extremal points, and*

(ii) *there exists an intersection point in $(T_{k-1}(\alpha^*), Z_k(\alpha^*))$.*

Proof. Let δ_0 be given as in Proposition 2.2. The assumption $\alpha^* \in \mathcal{G}_k$ implies that the functional defined in (4) satisfies

$$I(Z_k(\alpha^*), \alpha^*) = 0,$$

and thus $I(r, \alpha^*) > 0$ for all $r \in (0, Z_k(\alpha^*))$. In particular, for any $i = 1, 2, \dots, k-1$, we have

$$2F(u(T_i(\alpha^*), \alpha^*)) = I(T_i(\alpha^*), \alpha^*) > 0,$$

implying that $|u(T_i(\alpha^*), \alpha^*)| > \beta$. Hence, from the continuity of u and $T_i(\alpha)$ for $\alpha \in (\alpha^* - \delta_0, \alpha^* + \delta_0)$, we conclude that there exists $\bar{\delta}_1 < \delta_0$ such that the first assertion of the lemma holds.

From Proposition 3.1, for each $i = 1, 2, \dots, k-1$, there exists $r^* \in (T_{i-1}(\alpha^*), T_i(\alpha^*))$ such that $\varphi(r^*, \alpha^*) = 0$. Hence without loss of generality we may assume that there exist $r^- < r^* < r^+$ such that $\varphi(r^+, \alpha^*) < 0 < \varphi(r^-, \alpha^*)$. By continuity, there exists $\delta_1 \in (0, \bar{\delta}_1)$ such that $\varphi(r^-, \alpha) > 0$ and $\varphi(r^+, \alpha) < 0$ for all $\alpha \in (\alpha^* - \delta_2, \alpha^* + \delta_2)$. Since

$$u(r, \alpha_2) - u(r, \alpha_1) = \int_{\alpha_1}^{\alpha_2} \varphi(r, \alpha) d\alpha,$$

which is positive at $r = r^-$ and negative at $r = r^+$, and thus (i) is proved. (ii) follows in the same way. $\square$

4.1. Proof of Theorem 1.1.

We recall that in Theorem 1.1, $2 \leq n \leq 4$. Let $m < M$ be such that $r(s, \alpha)$ is defined and decreasing in $[m, M]$. For $s \in [m, M]$ we set

$$Q(s, \alpha) = -4 \frac{F}{f}(s) \frac{r(s, \alpha)}{r'(s, \alpha)} - \frac{r^2(s, \alpha)}{(r'(s, \alpha))^2} - 2r^2(s, \alpha)F(s) + H(s),$$

with

$$H'(s) = -4(n-2) \frac{F}{f}(s).$$

Then,

$$Q'(s, \alpha) = \frac{\partial Q}{\partial s}(s, \alpha) = \left(2(n-2) - 4 \left(\frac{F}{f}\right)'(s)\right) \frac{r(s, \alpha)}{r'(s, \alpha)}. \quad (14)$$

Similarly, for $\bar{m} < \bar{M}$ such that $\bar{r}(s, \alpha)$ is defined and increasing in $[\bar{m}, \bar{M}]$, we define

$$\bar{Q}(s, \alpha) = -4 \frac{F}{f}(s) \frac{\bar{r}(s, \alpha)}{\bar{r}'(s, \alpha)} - \frac{\bar{r}^2(s, \alpha)}{(\bar{r}'(s, \alpha))^2} - 2\bar{r}^2(s, \alpha)F(s) + \bar{H}(s),$$

with

$$\bar{H}'(s) = -4(n-2) \frac{F}{f}(s).$$

Note that if (f'_4) holds, then $Q'(s, \alpha) \geq 0$ for all $s \in [m, M]$ and $\bar{Q}'(s, \alpha) \leq 0$ for all $s \in [\bar{m}, \bar{M}]$.

Let now a and δ_1 be as in Lemma 4.1, let $\alpha_1, \alpha_2 \in (\alpha^* - \delta, \alpha^* + \delta)$, with $\alpha_1 < \alpha_2$, and for $j = 1, 2$ set

$$u_j(r) = u(r, \alpha_j), \quad r_j(s) = r(s, \alpha_j), \quad \text{and} \quad Q_j(s) = Q(s, \alpha_j).$$

Let

M_1, m_1 , be the i -th consecutive local maximum and minimum values of u_1 ,

and

M_2, m_2 , be the i -th consecutive local maximum and minimum values of u_2

for $r \in [0, T_{k-1}(\alpha^*) + a]$. The behavior of the solutions for $r > T_{k-1}(\alpha^*)$ will be studied separately. We have

Proposition 4.1. *Assume that f satisfies (f_1) – (f_2) and (f'_4) , and let $\alpha^* \in \mathcal{G}_k$. Then, there exists $\delta_{2,i} \in (0, \delta_1)$, with δ_1 as in Lemma 4.1, such that for any $\alpha_1, \alpha_2 \in (\alpha^* - \delta_{2,i}, \alpha^* + \delta_{2,i})$ with $\alpha_1 < \alpha_2$ we have that if*

$$M_1 < M_2 \text{ and } Q_1(M_1) > Q_2(M_2),$$

then

$$m_1 > m_2 \text{ and } Q_1(m_1) > Q_2(m_2).$$

In order to prove this result we need a separation lemma, so for $j = 1, 2$ we consider the functional W_j defined below, introduced in [FLS]:

$$W_j(s) = r_j(s) \sqrt{(u'_j(r_j(s)))^2 + 2F(s)}, \quad s \in [m_j, M_j],$$

The functional W_j is well defined in this interval, since $(u'_j(r))^2 + 2F(u_j(r)) > 0$ for $r \in [0, T_{k-1}(\alpha^*) + a]$.

Lemma 4.2. *Assume that f satisfies (f_1) – (f_2) , and let $\alpha^* \in \mathcal{G}_k$. Let $\alpha_1, \alpha_2 \in (\alpha^* - \delta_1, \alpha^* + \delta_1)$ with $\alpha_1 < \alpha_2$ and δ_1 as in Lemma 4.1. Assume that there exists $U \in [-\beta, \beta]$ such that*

$$r_1(U) \geq r_2(U) \quad \text{and} \quad W_1(U) < W_2(U). \quad (15)$$

Then

$$r_1(s) > r_2(s), \quad W_1(s) < W_2(s), \quad \text{for all } s \in [-\beta, U].$$

Proof. Clearly, $|r'_1(U)| > |r'_2(U)|$, and thus $r_1 > r_2$ in some small left neighborhood of U . Hence, there exists $c \in [-\beta, U)$ such that

$$W_1 \leq W_2, \quad r_1 > r_2, \quad \text{and} \quad r'_1 < r'_2 \quad \text{in } [c, U).$$

Next, we will show that $W_1 - W_2$ is increasing in $[c, U)$. This will imply that the infimum of such c is $-\beta$, proving the lemma.

From the definition of $W_j(s)$ we have

$$\frac{\partial W_j}{\partial s}(s) = \frac{-2F(s) + (n-2)(u'_j(r_j(s)))^2}{|u'_j(r_j(s))| \sqrt{(u'_j(r_j(s)))^2 + 2F(s)}}.$$

As $F(s) \leq 0$ for $s \in [-\beta, \beta]$, we have that the function

$$h(p) = \frac{-2F(s)}{p \sqrt{p^2 + 2F(s)}} + \frac{(n-2)p}{\sqrt{p^2 + 2F(s)}}, \quad p > 0,$$

is decreasing, and thus, for $s \in [c, U)$, and using that $|u'_1(r_1(s))| < |u'_2(r_2(s))|$, we obtain

$$\left(\frac{\partial W_1}{\partial s} - \frac{\partial W_2}{\partial s} \right)(s) = h(|u'_1(r_1(s))|) - h(|u'_2(r_2(s))|) > 0$$

as we claimed. □

Proof of Proposition 4.1. First we note that since Q_2 is strictly increasing, and $M_1 < M_2$, it holds that $Q_1(M_1) > Q_2(M_1)$.

Let M^* denote the i -th maximum value of $u(\cdot, \alpha^*)$. Since $u'(r(M^*, \alpha^*), \alpha^*) = 0$ and $4\frac{F}{f}(M^*) > 0$, by continuity there exists $\delta_{2,i} < \delta_1$ such that for any $\alpha_1, \alpha_2 \in (\alpha^* - \delta_{2,i}, \alpha^* + \delta_{2,i})$, we have

$$4\frac{F}{f}(M_1) > -r_2(M_1)u'_2(r_2(M_1)),$$

and hence

$$4\frac{F}{f}(M_1)r_2(M_1)u'_2(r_2(M_1)) + (r_2(M_1))^2(u'_2(r_2(M_1)))^2 < 0.$$

Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned} 0 &< (Q_1 - Q_2)(M_1) \\ &= 4\frac{F}{f}(M_1)r_2(M_1)u'_2(r_2(M_1)) + (r_2(M_1))^2(u'_2(r_2(M_1)))^2 + 2F(M_1)(r_2^2 - r_1^2)(M_1) \\ &< 2F(M_1)(r_2^2 - r_1^2)(M_1), \end{aligned}$$

implying

$$r_1(M_1) < r_2(M_1).$$

From Lemma 4.1 there exists a greatest intersection point U_I of r_1 and r_2 in $[\max\{m_1, m_2\}, M_1]$.

Let us set

$$U = \min\{-\beta, U_I\}.$$

We will show that

$$(Q_1 - Q_2)(U) > 0, \quad \text{and} \quad \frac{r_1}{|r'_1|}(U) < \frac{r_2}{|r'_2|}(U). \quad (16)$$

We distinguish the following cases according to the position of U_I :

Case 1. $U_I \in [\beta, M_1]$. We will prove first that

$$\frac{r_1}{|r'_1|}(s) < \frac{r_2}{|r'_2|}(s), \quad \text{for all } s \in [U_I, M_1].$$

Indeed, since $u'_1(r_1(M_1)) = 0$, we have that this inequality holds for $s = M_1$. Assume now that there exists $t \in (U_I, M_1)$ such that

$$\frac{r_1}{|r'_1|}(s) < \frac{r_2}{|r'_2|}(s), \quad \text{for all } s \in (t, M_1) \quad \text{and} \quad \frac{r_1}{|r'_1|}(t) = \frac{r_2}{|r'_2|}(t).$$

As

$$\frac{d}{ds}\left(\frac{r_1}{|r'_1|} - \frac{r_2}{|r'_2|}\right)(t) = f(t)(r_2|r'_2| - r_1|r'_1|)(t) = f(t)\frac{|r'_1|}{r_1}(t)(r_2^2 - r_1^2)(t) > 0,$$

we obtain a contradiction.

Assume next that there exists $t \in [\beta, U_I)$ such that

$$\frac{r_1}{|r'_1|}(s) < \frac{r_2}{|r'_2|}(s), \quad \text{for all } s \in (t, M_1) \quad \text{and} \quad \frac{r_1}{|r'_1|}(t) = \frac{r_2}{|r'_2|}(t).$$

Then, from (f'_4) ,

$$(Q_1 - Q_2)'(s) = 4\left(\frac{r_1}{|r'_1|}(s) - \frac{r_2}{|r'_2|}(s)\right)\left(\left(\frac{F}{f}\right)'(s) - \frac{n-2}{2}\right) < 0, \quad s \in (t, M_1)$$

implying that

$$0 > -2F(t)(r_1^2(t) - r_2^2(t)) = (Q_1 - Q_2)(t) > (Q_1 - Q_2)(M_1) > 0,$$

a contradiction. We conclude that

$$(Q_1 - Q_2)(\beta) > (Q_1 - Q_2)(M_1) > 0$$

implying

$$\frac{r_1}{|r'_1|}(\beta) < \frac{r_2}{|r'_2|}(\beta) \quad \text{and} \quad r_1(\beta) \geq r_2(\beta).$$

Now we can use Lemma 4.2 with $U = \beta$, to obtain that $r_1(-\beta) > r_2(-\beta)$ and $W_1(-\beta) < W_2(-\beta)$, implying (16) at $U = -\beta$.

Case 2. $U_I \in [-\beta, \beta]$. In this case $W_1(U_I) < W_2(U_I)$ and $r_1(U_I) = r_2(U_I)$, hence by Lemma 4.2, we conclude $W_1(-\beta) < W_2(-\beta)$ implying that (16) holds.

Case 3. $U_I \in [\max\{m_1, m_2\}, -\beta]$. In this case it is straightforward to verify that

$$(Q_1 - Q_2)(U_I) > 0,$$

and hence in this case (16) also holds.

To end the proof, assume that there exists $\tau \in (\max\{m_1, m_2\}, U]$ such that

$$\frac{r_1}{|r'_1|}(s) < \frac{r_2}{|r'_2|}(s), \quad \text{for all } s \in (\tau, U],$$

and

$$\frac{r_1}{|r'_1|}(\tau) = \frac{r_2}{|r'_2|}(\tau).$$

Then,

$$(Q_1 - Q_2)'(s) = 4 \left(\frac{r_1}{|r'_1|}(s) - \frac{r_2}{|r'_2|}(s) \right) \left(\left(\frac{F}{f} \right)'(s) - \frac{n-2}{2} \right) < 0, \quad s \in (\tau, U]$$

implying that

$$0 > -2F(\tau)(r_1^2(\tau) - r_2^2(\tau)) = (Q_1 - Q_2)(\tau) > (Q_1 - Q_2)(U) > 0,$$

a contradiction, and thus

$$\frac{r_1}{|r'_1|}(s) < \frac{r_2}{|r'_2|}(s), \quad \text{for all } s \in [\max\{m_1, m_2\}, U].$$

Therefore,

$$\max\{m_1, m_2\} = m_1, \quad (Q_1 - Q_2)'(s) > 0, \quad \text{for all } s \in [m_1, U],$$

which yields $Q_1(m_1) > Q_2(m_1)$. Since Q_2 increases and $m_1 > m_2$, it follows that $Q_1(m_1) > Q_2(m_2)$, ending the proof of the proposition. $\square$

Similarly we set

$$\bar{m}_1, \bar{M}_1 \text{ the } i\text{-th consecutive local minimum and maximum of } u_1,$$

and

$$\bar{m}_2, \bar{M}_2 \text{ the } i\text{-th consecutive local minimum and maximum of } u_2,$$

for $r \in [0, T_{k-1}(\alpha^*) + a]$.

We have the following result.

Proposition 4.2. *Assume that f satisfies (f_1) – (f_2) and (f'_4) , and let $\alpha^* \in \mathcal{G}_k$. Then, there exists $\bar{\delta}_{2,i} \in (0, \delta_1)$, with δ_1 as in Lemma 4.1, such that for any $\alpha_1, \alpha_2 \in (\alpha^* - \bar{\delta}_{2,i}, \alpha^* + \bar{\delta}_{2,i})$ with $\alpha_1 < \alpha_2$ we have that if*

$$\bar{m}_1 > \bar{m}_2 \text{ and } \bar{Q}_1(\bar{m}_1) > \bar{Q}_2(\bar{m}_2),$$

then

$$\bar{M}_1 < \bar{M}_2 \text{ and } \bar{Q}_1(\bar{M}_1) > \bar{Q}_2(\bar{M}_2).$$

Proof. It follows from Proposition 4.1 considering $v(r, \alpha_j) = -u(r, \alpha_j)$. $\square$

Combining Propositions 4.1 and 4.2 we obtain the following result.

Proposition 4.3. *Assume that f satisfies (f_1) – (f_2) and (f'_4) , and let $\alpha^* \in \mathcal{G}_k$. Let $\delta = \min_i \{\delta_{2,i}, \bar{\delta}_{2,i}\}$, and let $\alpha_1, \alpha_2 \in (\alpha^* - \delta, \alpha^* + \delta)$.*

(i) *If k is even, then the k -th extremal points $T_{k-1}(\alpha_i)$ are minima,*

$$m_1 > m_2 \quad \text{and} \quad Q_1(m_1) > Q_2(m_2),$$

where $m_i = u_i(T_{k-1}(\alpha_i))$.

(ii) *If k is odd, then the k -th extremal points $T_{k-1}(\alpha_i)$ are maxima,*

$$M_1 < M_2 \quad \text{and} \quad Q_1(M_1) > Q_2(M_2),$$

where $M_i = u_i(T_{k-1}(\alpha_i))$.

Proof. As $T_0(\alpha_i) = 0$ is the first extremal point of u_i , we have

$$u_1(T_0(\alpha_1)) = \alpha_1 < \alpha_2 = u_2(T_0(\alpha_2)).$$

Moreover, as $\alpha_i > \beta$, H is decreasing in $[\beta, \infty)$ and therefore

$$Q_1(\alpha_1) = H(\alpha_1) > H(\alpha_2) = Q_2(\alpha_2).$$

Hence, for the first extremal points, the assumption of Proposition 4.1 holds and thus,

$$u_1(T_1(\alpha_1)) > u_2(T_1(\alpha_2)), \quad \text{and} \quad Q_1(u_1(T_1(\alpha_1))) > Q_2(u_2(T_1(\alpha_2))).$$

Applying alternatively Proposition 4.2 and Proposition 4.1 we obtain the result. $\square$

We proceed now to our final step. To this end, we may assume without loss of generality that k is odd, so that $T_{k-1}(\alpha_j)$ is a maximum point, and we fix δ as given in Proposition 4.3.

Proposition 4.4. *Assume that f satisfies (f_1) – (f_2) and (f'_4) , and let $\alpha^* \in \mathcal{G}_k$. Let $\alpha_1, \alpha_2 \in (\alpha^* - \delta, \alpha^* + \delta)$ with $\alpha_1 < \alpha_2$.*

If $\alpha_1 \in \mathcal{G}_k \cup \mathcal{N}_k$, then $\alpha_2 \in \mathcal{N}_k$,

$$Z_k(\alpha_1) > Z_k(\alpha_2) \quad \text{and} \quad |u'_1(Z_k(\alpha_1))| < |u'_2(Z_k(\alpha_2))|. \quad (17)$$

If $\alpha_2 \in \mathcal{G}_k$, then $\alpha_1 \in \mathcal{F}_k$.

In order to prove this result we need the following separation lemma which can be found in [CGHY, Lemma 4.4.1]. Its proof is very similar to that of Lemma 4.2 and thus we omit it. Let

$$S_j := \inf\{s \in (U_k(\alpha_j), M_j) : |u'_j(r_j(s))|^2 + 2F(s) > 0\},$$

where $M_j = u_j(T_{k-1}(\alpha_j))$. We note that $S_j = 0$ if and only if $\alpha_j \in \mathcal{G}_k \cup \mathcal{N}_k$.

Lemma 4.3. *Assume that f satisfies (f_1) – (f_2) , and let $\alpha^* \in \mathcal{G}_k$. Let $\alpha_1, \alpha_2 \in (\alpha^* - \delta, \alpha^* + \delta)$ with $\alpha_1 < \alpha_2$. Assume that there exists $U \in [0, \beta]$ such that*

$$r_1(U) \geq r_2(U) \quad \text{and} \quad W_1(U) < W_2(U). \quad (18)$$

Then, $S_1 \geq S_2$ and

$$r_1(s) > r_2(s), \quad W_1(s) < W_2(s), \quad \text{and} \quad |u'_1(r_1(s))| < |u'_2(r_2(s))| \quad s \in [S_1, U].$$

Proof of Proposition 4.4. Let r_I denote the first intersection point of u_1 and u_2 in $(T_{k-1}(\alpha^*), Z_k(\alpha^*))$ guaranteed by Lemma 4.1(ii) and $U_I = u_j(r_I)$. Arguing as in the proof of Proposition 4.1, cases 1 and 2, this time with $U = \min\{\beta, U_I\}$, we obtain that (15) holds. Hence, by Lemma 4.3, we have $S_1 \geq S_2$,

$$r_1(s) > r_2(s), \quad W_1(s) < W_2(s), \quad \text{and} \quad |u'_1(r_1(s))| < |u'_2(r_2(s))| \quad \text{for all } s \in [S_1, U].$$

If $\alpha_1 \in \mathcal{G}_k \cup \mathcal{N}_k$, then $S_1 = 0$ implying $S_2 = 0$ and $\alpha_2 \in \mathcal{G}_k \cup \mathcal{N}_k$. As $Z_k(\alpha_1) = r_1(0) > r_2(0) = Z_k(\alpha_2)$ and $|u'_1(Z_k(\alpha_1))| < |u'_2(Z_k(\alpha_2))|$ we conclude that $\alpha_2 \in \mathcal{N}_k$.

If $\alpha_2 \in \mathcal{G}_k$, then $S_2 = 0$. As $|u'_2(Z_k(\alpha_2))| = 0$, we conclude that $S_1 > 0$ implying $\alpha_1 \in \mathcal{F}_k$. $\square$

Proof of Theorem 1.1 . Let $\alpha^* \in \mathcal{G}_k$ hence by Proposition 4.4, $(\alpha^*, \alpha^* + \delta) \subset \mathcal{N}_k$. Let

$$\bar{\alpha} = \sup\{\alpha > \alpha^* : (\alpha^*, \alpha) \subset \mathcal{N}_k\}.$$

Assume $\bar{\alpha} < \infty$. Since $\mathcal{P}_k$ and $\mathcal{N}_k$ are open, we deduce that $\bar{\alpha} \in \mathcal{G}_k$. By Proposition 4.4, $(\bar{\alpha} - \delta, \bar{\alpha}) \subset \mathcal{F}_k$, a contradiction, and thus $(\alpha^*, \infty) \subset \mathcal{N}_k$. Hence, there exists at most one solution of (1) with exactly $k - 1$ sign changes in $(0, \infty)$. $\square$

4.2. Proof of Theorem 1.2.

In what follows we use the ideas of Pucci, Serrin and Tang in [PuS, ST]. For $s \in (\bar{U}_1(\alpha), -\beta]$ we set

$$P(s, \alpha) = -2n \frac{F}{f}(s) \frac{r^{n-1}(s, \alpha)}{r'(s, \alpha)} - \frac{r^n(s, \alpha)}{(r'(s, \alpha))^2} - 2r^n(s, \alpha)F(s).$$

Then,

$$P'(s, \alpha) = \frac{\partial P}{\partial s}(s, \alpha) = \left(n - 2 - 2n \left(\frac{F}{f}\right)'(s)\right) \frac{r^{n-1}(s, \alpha)}{r'(s, \alpha)}. \quad (19)$$

By (f_4) it holds that $P'(s, \alpha) \geq 0$ for all $s \in (\bar{U}_1(\alpha), -\beta]$.

In this case we can prove the analogue of Proposition 4.1 but only for the first maximal and minimal points of u_1 and u_2 . Let now $\alpha_1, \alpha_2 \in (\alpha^* - \delta, \alpha^* + \delta)$, with $\alpha_1 < \alpha_2$, and set

$$P_1(s) = P(s, \alpha_1), \quad P_2(s) = P(s, \alpha_2), \\ m_1 = u_1(T_1(\alpha_1)), \quad m_2 = u_2(T_1(\alpha_2)).$$

We have

Proposition 4.5. *Assume that f satisfies (f_1) – (f_3) and (f_4) , or (f_1) – (f_2) and (f_5) – (f_6) , and let $\alpha^* \in \mathcal{G}_k$. Let $\alpha_1, \alpha_2 \in (\alpha^* - \delta, \alpha^* + \delta)$ with $\alpha_1 < \alpha_2$ and $\delta = \delta_1$ as in Lemma 4.1. Then,*

$$m_1 > m_2 \text{ and } P_1(m_1) > P_2(m_2). \quad (20)$$

In order to prove this result we need the following variations of lemma 4.2, so for $j = 1, 2$ we consider the functional $\tilde{W}_j$ defined below,

$$\tilde{W}_j(s) = r_j^{n-1}(s) \sqrt{(u'_j(r_j(s)))^2 + 2F(s)}, \quad s \in [m_j, \alpha_j].$$

From Lemma 4.1, the solutions u_1 and u_2 intersect at a first $r_I > 0$. Set $U_I = u_1(r_I) = u_2(r_I)$.

Lemma 4.4. *Let f satisfy (f_1) -(f_3). Let $\alpha_1, \alpha_2 \in (\alpha^* - \delta, \alpha^* + \delta)$ with $\alpha_1 < \alpha_2$ and $\delta = \delta_1$ as in Lemma 4.1. If $U_I \in [-\beta, \beta]$ then*

$$r_1(s) > r_2(s) \quad \text{and} \quad \tilde{W}_1(s) < \tilde{W}_2(s), \quad \text{for all } s \in [-\beta, U_I].$$

Proof. Clearly, $|r'_1(U_I)| > |r'_2(U_I)|$, and thus $r_1 > r_2$ in some small left neighborhood of U_I . Hence, there exists $c \in [-\beta, U_I]$ such that

$$\tilde{W}_1 \leq \tilde{W}_2, \quad r_1 > r_2, \quad \text{and} \quad r'_1 < r'_2 \quad \text{in } [c, U_I].$$

Next, we will show that $\tilde{W}_1 - \tilde{W}_2$ is increasing in $[c, U_I]$. This will imply that the infimum of such c is $-\beta$, proving the theorem.

From the definition of $\tilde{W}(s, \alpha)$ we have

$$\frac{\partial \tilde{W}}{\partial s}(s, \alpha) = \frac{2(n-1)r^{n-2}(s, \alpha)F(s)}{u'(r(s, \alpha), \alpha) \sqrt{(u'(r(s, \alpha), \alpha))^2 + 2F(s)}},$$

and thus, for $s \in [c, U_I]$,

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{1}{2(n-1)} \left(\frac{\partial \tilde{W}_1}{\partial s}(s) - \frac{\partial \tilde{W}_2}{\partial s}(s) \right) \\ &= F(s) \left(\frac{r_1^{n-2}(s)}{u'_1(r_1(s)) \sqrt{(u'_1(r_1(s)))^2 + 2F(s)}} - \frac{r_2^{n-2}(s)}{u'_2(r_2(s)) \sqrt{(u'_2(r_2(s)))^2 + 2F(s)}} \right) \\ &\geq r_2^{n-2}(s) |F(s)| \left(\frac{1}{|u'_1(r_1(s))| \sqrt{(u'_1(r_1(s)))^2 + 2F(s)}} \right. \\ &\quad \left. - \frac{1}{|u'_2(r_2(s))| \sqrt{(u'_2(r_2(s)))^2 + 2F(s)}} \right) \\ &\geq 0. \end{aligned}$$

□

For the case when f satisfies (f_5) -(f_6) we use [CGHY, Proposition 4.1.2]. Even though in this proposition we assumed f superlinear, this assumption is not used in the proof, so we state it here without proof.

Lemma 4.5. *Let f satisfy (f_1) -(f_2) and (f_5) -(f_6). Then there exists $\delta \in (0, \delta_1]$ such that for all $\alpha_1, \alpha_2 \in (\alpha^* - \delta, \alpha^* + \delta)$ with $\alpha_1 < \alpha_2$ it holds that*

$$r_1(s) > r_2(s) \quad \text{and} \quad \tilde{W}_1(s) < \tilde{W}_2(s), \quad \text{for all } s \in [-\beta, U_{bI}],$$

where $U_{bI} = \min\{b, U_I\}$.

Proof of Proposition 4.5. We prove this proposition in the case that f satisfies (f_1) – (f_3) and (f_4) , the proof when f satisfies (f_5) – (f_6) follows similarly by using Lemma 4.5. As in [ET, ST], we set

$$S_{12}(s) = \frac{r_1^{n-1} r_2'}{r_2^{n-1} r_1'}(s).$$

Then

$$S'_{12}(s) = S_{12}(s)f(s)((r_2'(s))^2 - (r_1'(s))^2). \quad (21)$$

Let

$$U = \min\{-\beta, U_I\}.$$

We will prove first that $m_1 > m_2$ and that for all $s \in [m_1, U]$ we have

$$S_{12}(s) < 1, \quad |r_1'(s)| > |r_2'(s)|, \quad r_1(s) > r_2(s). \quad (22)$$

If $U_I > -\beta$ then $U = -\beta$, and, from Lemma 4.4, and using that $F(-\beta) = 0$, we have that $S_{12}(U) \leq 1$ and $r_1(U) > r_2(U)$. Thus, $|r_1'(U)| > |r_2'(U)|$. On the other hand, if $U = U_I$, we also have that $S_{12}(U) < 1$ and $|r_1'(U)| > |r_2'(U)|$.

From (21) we have that $S_{12}(s)$ is increasing as long as $|r_1'(s)| > |r_2'(s)|$, for $s < U$. If (22) does not hold for all $s \in (\max\{m_1, m_2\}, U)$, then at the largest point s_0 where it fails, we must have that $|r_1'(s_0)| = |r_2'(s_0)|$ and $r_1(s_0) > r_2(s_0)$ implying that $S_{12}(s_0) > 1$, a contradiction. Thus (22) holds in $(\max\{m_1, m_2\}, U)$, and hence $m_1 = \max\{m_1, m_2\}$.

Next we prove that $P_1 > P_2$ in $[m_1, U]$. From the definition of P_1 and P_2 we have

$$\begin{aligned} (P_1 - P_2)(U) &= \left(\frac{r_2^n}{(r_2')^2} - \frac{r_1^n}{(r_1')^2} \right)(U) + 2n \frac{F}{f}(U) \left(\frac{r_1^{n-1}(U)}{|r_1'(U)|} - \frac{r_2^{n-1}(U)}{|r_2'(U)|} \right) \\ &\geq \left(\frac{r_2^n}{(r_2')^2} - \frac{r_1^n}{(r_1')^2} \right)(U) \\ &= \left(\frac{r_2^n}{(r_2')^2} \left[1 - S_{12}^2 \frac{r_2^{n-2}}{r_1^{n-2}} \right] \right)(U) > 0. \end{aligned}$$

On the other hand, from (f_4) and (22),

$$(P_1 - P_2)'(s) = (S_{12}(s) - 1) \left(n - 2 - 2n \left(\frac{F}{f} \right)'(s) \right) \frac{r_2^{n-1}}{r_2'}(s) < 0,$$

implying that $P_1 > P_2$ in $[m_1, U]$. In particular, $P_1(m_1) > P_2(m_1)$. Now, since $P_2' > 0$, we have that $P_2(m_1) > P_2(m_2)$, and thus $P_1(m_1) > P_2(m_2)$, ending the proof of the proposition. $\square$

The analogue of Lemma 4.3 for the case $k = 2$ can be found in [CGHY, Lemma 4.4.1], we state it below for the sake of completeness. Set

$$\bar{W}(s, \alpha) = \bar{r}(s, \alpha) \sqrt{(u'(\bar{r}(s, \alpha), \alpha))^2 + 2F(s)}, \quad s \in [m_1(\alpha), S(\alpha)],$$

where

$$\bar{S}_j := \sup\{s \in (m_j, U_2(\alpha_j)) : (u'_j(\bar{r}_j(s)))^2 + 2F(s) > 0\}.$$

Lemma 4.6. Assume that f satisfies (f_1) – (f_3) , and let $\alpha^* \in \mathcal{G}_2$. Let $\alpha_1, \alpha_2 \in (\alpha^* - \delta, \alpha^* + \delta)$ with $\alpha_1 < \alpha_2$. Assume that there exists $U \in [-\beta, 0]$ such that

$$r_1(U) \geq r_2(U) \quad \text{and} \quad \bar{W}_1(U) < \bar{W}_2(U). \quad (23)$$

Then,

$$\bar{S}_1 \leq \bar{S}_2$$

and

$$\bar{r}_1(s) > \bar{r}_2(s), \quad W_1(s) < W_2(s), \quad \text{and} \quad u'_1(\bar{r}_1(s)) < u'_2(\bar{r}_2(s)) \quad s \in (U, \bar{S}_1].$$

We define

$$\begin{aligned} \bar{P}(s, \alpha) &= -2n \frac{F}{f}(s) \frac{\bar{r}^{n-1}(s, \alpha)}{\bar{r}'(s, \alpha)} - \frac{\bar{r}^n(s, \alpha)}{(\bar{r}'(s, \alpha))^2} - 2\bar{r}^n(s, \alpha)F(s), \\ \bar{P}'(s, \alpha) &= \left(n - 2 - 2n \left(\frac{F}{f} \right)'(s) \right) \frac{\bar{r}^{n-1}(s, \alpha)}{\bar{r}'(s, \alpha)}, \\ \bar{S}_{12}(s) &= \frac{\bar{r}_1^{n-1} \bar{r}_2'}{\bar{r}_2^{n-1} \bar{r}_1'}(s), \\ \bar{S}'_{12}(s) &= \bar{S}_{12}(s) f(s) ((\bar{r}'_2(s))^2 - (\bar{r}'_1(s))^2). \end{aligned} \tag{24}$$

Proposition 4.6. *Assume that f satisfies (f_1) - (f_3) and (f_4) , and let $\alpha^* \in \mathcal{G}_2$. Then there exists $\delta > 0$ such that for $\alpha_1, \alpha_2 \in (\alpha^* - \delta, \alpha^* + \delta)$ with $\alpha_1 < \alpha_2$ it holds that:*

if $\alpha_1 \in \mathcal{G}_2 \cup \mathcal{N}_2$, then $\alpha_2 \in \mathcal{N}_2$,

$$Z_2(\alpha_1) > Z_2(\alpha_2) \quad \text{and} \quad |u'_1(Z_2(\alpha_1))| < |u'_2(Z_2(\alpha_2))|, \tag{25}$$

and if $\alpha_2 \in \mathcal{G}_2$, then $\alpha_1 \in \mathcal{F}_2$.

Proof. Let m^* denote the minimum value of $u(\cdot, \alpha^*)$. Since $u'(r(m^*, \alpha^*), \alpha^*) = 0$ and $-2n \frac{F}{f}(m^*) > 0$, by continuity we may choose $\delta \in (0, \delta_2)$ small enough so that

$$-2n \frac{F}{f}(m_1) > \bar{r}_2(m_1) u'_2(\bar{r}_2(m_1)),$$

for all $\alpha_1, \alpha_2 \in (\alpha^* - \delta, \alpha^* + \delta)$ and hence

$$-2n \frac{F}{f}(m_1) (\bar{r}_2(m_1))^{n-1} u'_2(\bar{r}_2(m_1)) - (\bar{r}_2(m_1))^n (u'_2(\bar{r}_2(m_1)))^2 > 0. \tag{26}$$

On the other hand, from (20) in Proposition 4.5, we have that $P_1(m_1) > P_2(m_2)$ and thus, using $m_2 < m_1$ and the fact that $\bar{P}_2$ decreases, we find that

$$\bar{P}_1(m_1) = P_1(m_1) > P_2(m_2) = \bar{P}_2(m_2) > \bar{P}_2(m_1).$$

Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned} 0 &> (\bar{P}_2 - \bar{P}_1)(m_1) \\ &= -2n \frac{F}{f}(m_1) (\bar{r}_2(m_1))^{n-1} u'_2(\bar{r}_2(m_1)) - (\bar{r}_2(m_1))^n (u'_2(\bar{r}_2(m_1)))^2 \\ &\quad - 2F(m_1) (\bar{r}_2^n - \bar{r}_1^n)(m_1) \end{aligned}$$

implying, by (26),

$$\bar{r}_1(m_1) < \bar{r}_2(m_1).$$

We recall that from lemma 4.1(ii), there exists an intersection point in $(T_1(\alpha^*), Z_2(\alpha^*))$. If $\bar{r}_I$ denotes the first of such points and if $\bar{U}_I = u_1(\bar{r}_I) = u_2(\bar{r}_I)$, then $\bar{U}_I \in (\bar{U}_1(\alpha^*), 0]$. Let us set

$$U = \max\{-\beta, \bar{U}_I\}.$$

We will show that U satisfies (15) in Lemma 4.6, that is,

$$\bar{r}_1(U) \geq \bar{r}_2(U), \quad \text{and} \quad \bar{W}_1(U) < \bar{W}_2(U). \tag{27}$$

We distinguish two cases:

Case 1. $\bar{U}_I \in [m_1, -\beta]$. We will first prove

$$\frac{\bar{r}_1^{n-1}}{\bar{r}_1'}(s) < \frac{\bar{r}_2^{n-1}}{\bar{r}_2'}(s) \quad \text{and} \quad \bar{P}_1(s) > \bar{P}_2(s) \quad \text{for all } s \in [m_1, \bar{U}_I]. \quad (28)$$

Observe first that $\bar{S}_{12}(m_1) = 0$ and $\bar{S}_{12}(\bar{U}_I) < 1$. If there exists a point $t \in (m_1, \bar{U}_I)$ such that $\bar{S}_{12}'(t) = 0$, then $\bar{r}_1'(t) = \bar{r}_2'(t)$ and hence, from the definition of $\bar{U}_I$,

$$\bar{S}_{12}(t) = \frac{\bar{r}_1^{n-1}}{\bar{r}_2^{n-1}}(t) < 1,$$

implying $\bar{S}_{12}(s) < 1$ for $s \in [m_1, \bar{U}_I]$.

On the other hand, from the second equation in (24), using that $\bar{S}_{12}(s) < 1$ and (f_4) , we obtain

$$(\bar{P}_1 - \bar{P}_2)'(s) = \left((\bar{S}_{12} - 1) \left(n - 2 - 2n \left(\frac{F}{f} \right)' \right) \frac{\bar{r}_2^{n-1}}{\bar{r}_2'} \right)(s) > 0.$$

Hence, for all $s \in (m_1, \bar{U}_I)$, $\bar{P}_1(s) - \bar{P}_2(s) > \bar{P}_1(m_1) - \bar{P}_2(m_1) > 0$

Next we will prove that

$$\bar{r}_1(s) > \bar{r}_2(s), \quad \text{and} \quad \frac{\bar{r}_1}{\bar{r}_1'}(s) < \frac{\bar{r}_2}{\bar{r}_2'}(s) \quad \text{for all } s \in (\bar{U}_I, -\beta]. \quad (29)$$

From the definition of $\bar{U}_I$, $\frac{\bar{r}_1}{\bar{r}_1'} < \frac{\bar{r}_2}{\bar{r}_2'}$ at $\bar{U}_I$. Assume by contradiction that (29) does not hold. Then, there exists a first point $t \in (\bar{U}_I, -\beta)$ such that

$$\frac{\bar{r}_1}{\bar{r}_1'}(t) = \frac{\bar{r}_2}{\bar{r}_2'}(t) \quad \text{and} \quad \bar{r}_1(s) > \bar{r}_2(s), \quad \text{for all } s \in (\bar{U}_I, t],$$

implying

$$\bar{S}_{12}(t) = \left(\frac{\bar{r}_1(t)}{\bar{r}_2(t)} \right)^{n-2} = D > 1.$$

From the definition of $\bar{P}_1$ and $\bar{P}_2$, we have that

$$(\bar{P}_1 - D\bar{P}_2)(t) = 2(D\bar{r}_2^n - \bar{r}_1^n)F(t) = 2\bar{r}_1^{n-2}(\bar{r}_2^2 - \bar{r}_1^2)F(t) < 0.$$

On the other hand, from (28), we have that $(\bar{P}_1 - \bar{P}_2)(\bar{U}_I) > 0$. Since $\bar{P}_2(m_2) < 0$ and $\bar{P}_2$ decreases in $(m_2, -\beta)$, we have that $\bar{P}_2(\bar{U}_I) < 0$. Hence, as $D > 1$, we conclude that

$$(\bar{P}_1 - D\bar{P}_2)(\bar{U}_I) > 0.$$

From the last equation in (24) we obtain that $\bar{S}_{12}$ is increasing in $(\bar{U}_I, t)$ implying that $\bar{S}_{12}(s) < D$. Finally, using (f_4) we deduce

$$(\bar{P}_1 - D\bar{P}_2)'(s) = \left((\bar{S}_{12} - D) \left(n - 2 - 2n \left(\frac{F}{f} \right)' \right) \frac{\bar{r}_2^{n-1}}{\bar{r}_2'} \right)(s) > 0$$

for all $s \in (\bar{U}_I, t)$ and thus

$$(\bar{P}_1 - D\bar{P}_2)(t) > 0,$$

a contradiction. Hence, (28) follows, and, since $F(-\beta) = 0$, also (27).

Case 2. $\bar{U}_I \in [-\beta, 0)$. In this case $U = \bar{U}_I$, and (27) trivially holds.

Hence, by Lemma 4.6, we have $\bar{S}_1 \leq \bar{S}_2$,

$$r_1(s) > r_2(s), \quad \bar{W}_1(s) < \bar{W}_2(s), \quad \text{and} \quad u_1'(r_1(s)) < u_2'(r_2(s)) \quad \text{for all } s \in (U, S_1].$$

If $\alpha_1 \in \mathcal{G}_2 \cup \mathcal{N}_2$, then $S_1 = 0$ implying $S_2 = 0$ and $\alpha_2 \in \mathcal{G}_2 \cup \mathcal{N}_2$. As $Z_2(\alpha_1) = \bar{r}_1(0) > \bar{r}_2(0) = Z_2(\alpha_2)$ and $u'_1(Z_2(\alpha_1)) < u'_2(Z_2(\alpha_2))$ we conclude that $\alpha_2 \in \mathcal{N}_2$.

If $\alpha_2 \in \mathcal{G}_2$, then $\bar{S}_2 = 0$. As $u'_2(Z_2(\alpha_2)) = 0$, we conclude that $\bar{S}_1 < 0$ implying $\alpha_1 \in \mathcal{F}_2$. $\square$

Proof of Theorem 1.2 . Let $\alpha^* \in \mathcal{G}_2$ hence by Lemma 4.6, $(\alpha^*, \alpha^* + \delta) \subset \mathcal{N}_2$. Let

$$\bar{\alpha} = \sup\{\alpha > \alpha^* : (\alpha^*, \alpha) \subset \mathcal{N}_2\}.$$

Assume $\bar{\alpha} < \infty$. Since $\mathcal{P}_2$ and $\mathcal{N}_2$ are open, we deduce that $\bar{\alpha} \in \mathcal{G}_2$. By Lemma 4.6, $(\bar{\alpha} - \delta, \bar{\alpha}) \subset \mathcal{F}_2$, a contradiction, and thus $(\alpha^*, \infty) \subset \mathcal{N}_2$. Hence, there exists at most one solution of (1) with exactly one sign change in $(0, \infty)$. $\square$

5. THE DIRICHLET PROBLEM

We begin this section by noting that under assumptions (f_1) – (f_3) , there might be non uniqueness of the solutions to the Dirichlet problem (2) in some balls, that is, for some values of $\rho > 0$. Indeed, assume that in addition to (f_1) – (f_3) , it holds that

$$\liminf_{s \rightarrow \infty} \frac{F(s)}{s^2} = 0. \quad (30)$$

Then the results in [FLS] hold, and in particular, there exists a ground state solution of (1). Let α^* be the greatest initial value which gives rise to this solution. If the support of this solution is not compact, then for $\alpha > \alpha^*$ but close, it happens that $\alpha \in \mathcal{N}_1$ and $Z_1(\alpha) \rightarrow \infty$ as $\alpha \downarrow \alpha^*$. If the solution has compact support, then from Proposition 3.1 (ii), for $\alpha > \alpha^*$ but close enough, $Z_1(\alpha) < Z_1(\alpha^*)$.

On the other hand, by denoting by $r(\beta, \alpha)$ the first positive value of r at which $u(r, \alpha) = \beta$. Since $F(u(r)) > 0$ for $r \in [0, r(\beta, \alpha)]$, we have that $|u'(r)| \leq \sqrt{2F(\alpha)}$ for all $r \in [0, r(\beta, \alpha)]$. Hence, from the mean value theorem, there exists $\xi \in [0, r(\beta, \alpha)]$ such that

$$\frac{\alpha - \beta}{r(\beta, \alpha)} = |u'(\xi)| \leq \sqrt{2F(\alpha)},$$

implying that

$$r(\beta, \alpha) \geq \frac{\alpha - \beta}{\sqrt{2F(\alpha)}},$$

and thus, from (30), there exists a sequence $\alpha_i \rightarrow \infty$ as $i \rightarrow \infty$ such that $r(\beta, \alpha_i) \rightarrow \infty$ as $i \rightarrow \infty$. From Proposition 3.2, $r(\beta, \alpha)$ is increasing in α , and hence $\lim_{\alpha \rightarrow \infty} r(\beta, \alpha) = \infty$. This in turn implies that

$$\lim_{\alpha \rightarrow \infty} Z_1(\alpha) = \infty,$$

and our claim follows.

Let now f satisfy (f'_1) – (f'_3) and (f_4) (with $\beta = 0$). We claim that there cannot exist bound state solutions to (1) with a finite number of zeros. Indeed, we first observe that from condition (f'_3) , it easily follows that for any $s_0 > 0$ there exists a positive constant C_0 such that

$$f(s) \geq C_0 s \quad \text{for all } s \in (0, s_0). \quad (31)$$

Now let u be a solution to (1) with, say, k zeros. Without loss of generality we may assume $0 < u(r) < s_0$ for r large, hence u decreases for $r \geq r_0$, r_0 large, and thus

$$-r^{n-1}u'(r) \geq \int_{r/2}^r t^{n-1}f(u(t))dt \geq C_0 \int_{r/2}^r t^{n-1}u(t)dt \geq Cr^n u(r)$$

for all $r \geq 2r_0$ and some positive constant C . Hence

$$-\frac{u'(r)}{u(r)} \geq Cr, \quad r \geq 2r_0,$$

and thus

$$u(r) \leq C_1 e^{-r^2} \quad \text{for all } r \geq 2r_0 \quad (32)$$

and some positive constant C_1 . Setting

$$P(r) = -2n \frac{F}{f}(u(r)) r^{n-1} u'(r) - r^n (u'(r))^2 - 2r^n F(u(r)),$$

we have that

$$P'(r) = \left(n - 2 - 2n \left(\frac{F}{f} \right)'(u(r)) \right) r^{n-1} |u'(r)|^2 < 0.$$

Since $P(0) = 0$, and thanks to (32) and (f'_3) , also $\lim_{r \rightarrow \infty} P(r) = 0$, we obtain a contradiction.

Hence, for f satisfying (f'_1) – (f'_3) , we are led to study the uniqueness of solutions with a prescribed number of zeros to the Dirichlet problem (2).

Proof of Theorem 1.3. It is based on the following facts:

- (1) Proposition 3.1 for the case $b = 0$, that is, between two consecutive zeros of u' there is at least one zero of φ .
- (2) The identity

$$(r^{n-1}(u'\varphi - \varphi'u))' = r^{n-1}\varphi(uf'(u) - f(u))$$

and condition (f'_3) say that there cannot be two zeros of φ in $(Z_i(\alpha), Z_{i+1}(\alpha))$, and

- (3) We have that

$$\frac{d}{d\alpha} Z_i(\alpha) = -\frac{\varphi}{u'} > 0 \quad \text{for all } i.$$

The details are left to the interested reader.

REFERENCES

- [BL] BERESTYCKI, H., LIONS, P. L., Non linear scalar fields equations I, Existence of a ground state, *Archive Rat. Mech. Anal.* **82** (1983), 313-345.
- [CM] CARISTI, G., MITIDIERI, E. Nonexistence of positive solutions of quasilinear equations, *Adv. Differential Equations* **2** (1997), no. 3, 319–359.
- [Ch-L] CHEN, C.C., LIN, C.S., Uniqueness of the ground state solutions of $\Delta u + f(u) = 0$ in $\mathbb{R}^N$, $N \geq 3$, *Comm. in Partial Differential Equations* **16** (1991), 1549-1572.
- [C1] COFFMAN, C. V., Uniqueness of the ground state solution of $\Delta u - u + u^3 = 0$ and a variational characterization of other solutions, *Archive Rat. Mech. Anal.* **46** (1972), 81-95.
- [C2] COFFMAN, C. V., A nonlinear boundary value problem with many positive solutions, *J. Differential Equations* **54** (1984), 429-437.
- [CEF1] CORTÁZAR, C., FELMER, P., ELGUETA, M., On a semilinear elliptic problem in $\mathbb{R}^N$ with a non Lipschitzian nonlinearity, *Advances in Differential Equations* **1** (1996), 199-218.
- [CEF2] CORTÁZAR, C., FELMER, P., ELGUETA, M., Uniqueness of positive solutions of $\Delta u + f(u) = 0$ in $\mathbb{R}^N$, $N \geq 3$, *Archive Rat. Mech. Anal.* **142** (1998), 127-141.
- [CGH] CORTÁZAR, C., GARCÍA-HUIDOBRO, M., On the uniqueness of ground state solutions of a semi-linear equation containing a weighted Laplacian, *Comm. Pure. Appl. Anal.* **5** (2006), 813-826.

- [CGHY] CORTÁZAR, C., GARCÍA-HUIDOBRO, M., YARUR, C. On the uniqueness of the second bound state solution of a semilinear equation, *Ann. Inst. Henri Poincaré, AN* (2009), doi:10.1016/j.anihpc.2009.01.004.
- [ET] ERBE, L., TANG, M., Uniqueness theorems for positive solutions of quasilinear elliptic equations in a ball, *J. Diff. Equations* **138** (1997), 351-379.
- [FLS] FRANCHI, B., LANCONELLI, E., SERRIN, J., Existence and Uniqueness of nonnegative solutions of quasilinear equations in $\mathbb{R}^n$, *Advances in mathematics* **118** (1996), 177-243.
- [GHH] GARCÍA-HUIDOBRO, M., AND HENAO, D., On the uniqueness of positive solutions of a quasilinear equation containing a weighted p -Laplacian, *Comm. in Contemp. Math.* **10** (2008), 405-432.
- [K] KWONG, M. K., Uniqueness of positive solutions of $\Delta u - u + u^p = 0$, *Archive Rat. Mech. Anal.* **105** (1989), 243-266.
- [LN1] LI Y., NI WEI-M., On the existence and symmetry properties of finite total mass solutions of the Matukuma equation, the Eddington equation and their generalizations, *Arch. Rat. Mech. Anal.* **108** (1989), 175-194.
- [LN2] LI Y., NI WEI-M., On the asymptotic behavior and radial symmetry of positive solutions of semilinear elliptic equations I, *Arch. Rat. Mech. Anal* **118** (1992), 195-222.
- [LN3] LI Y., NI WEI-M., On the asymptotic behavior and radial symmetry of positive solutions of semilinear elliptic equations II, *Arch. Rat. Mech. Anal* **118** (1992), 223-243.
- [McL] MCLEOD, K., Uniqueness of positive radial solutions of $\Delta u + f(u) = 0$ in $\mathbb{R}^N$, II, *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.* **339** (1993), 495-505.
- [McLS] MCLEOD, K., SERRIN, J., Uniqueness of positive radial solutions of $\Delta u + f(u) = 0$ in $\mathbb{R}^N$, *Arch. Rational Mech. Anal.*, **99** (1987), 115-145.
- [McLTW] MCLEOD, K., TROY, W. C., WEISSLER, F. B., Radial solutions of $\Delta u + f(u) = 0$ with prescribed numbers of zeros, *J. Differential Equations* **83** (1990), no. 2, 368-378.
- [PeS1] PELETIER, L., SERRIN, J., Uniqueness of positive solutions of quasilinear equations, *Archive Rat. Mech. Anal.* **81** (1983), 181-197.
- [PeS2] PELETIER, L., SERRIN, J., Uniqueness of nonnegative solutions of quasilinear equations, *J. Diff. Equat.* **61** (1986), 380-397.
- [PuS] PUCCI, P., R., SERRIN, J., Uniqueness of ground states for quasilinear elliptic operators, *Indiana Univ. Math. J.* **47** (1998), 529-539.
- [ST] SERRIN, J., AND TANG, M., Uniqueness of ground states for quasilinear elliptic equations, *Indiana Univ. Math. J.* **49** (2000), 897-923.
- [T] TROY, W., The existence and uniqueness of bound state solutions of a semilinear equation, *Proc. R. Soc A* **461** (2005), 2941-2963.

DEPARTAMENTO DE MATEMÁTICA, PONTIFICIA UNIVERSIDAD CATÓLICA DE CHILE, CASILLA 306, CORREO 22, SANTIAGO, CHILE.

E-mail address: ccortaza@mat.puc.cl

DEPARTAMENTO DE MATEMÁTICA, PONTIFICIA UNIVERSIDAD CATÓLICA DE CHILE, CASILLA 306, CORREO 22, SANTIAGO, CHILE.

E-mail address: mgarcia@mat.puc.cl

DEPARTAMENTO DE MATEMÁTICA Y C.C., UNIVERSIDAD DE SANTIAGO DE CHILE, CASILLA 307, CORREO 2, SANTIAGO, CHILE

E-mail address: cyarur@usach.cl